arXiv:1609.02442v2 [math.CO] 17 Apr 2017

A note on the size of $\mathcal{N}$-free families

Ryan R. Martin*
Department of Mathematics
Iowa State University
396 Carver Hall
Ames, Iowa, U.S.A.
rymartin@iastate.edu

Shanise Walker
Department of Mathematics
Iowa State University
396 Carver Hall
Ames, Iowa, U.S.A.
shanise1@iastate.edu

Submitted: February 21, 2017;
Mathematics Subject Classifications: 06A06

Abstract

The $\mathcal{N}$ poset consists of four distinct sets W, X, Y, Z such that $W \subset X$, $Y \subset X$, and $Y \subset Z$ where W is not necessarily a subset of Z. A family $\mathcal{F}$, considered as a subposet of the n-dimensional Boolean lattice $\mathcal{B}_n$, is $\mathcal{N}$-free if it does not contain $\mathcal{N}$ as a subposet. Let $\mathrm{La}(n, \mathcal{N})$ be the size of a largest $\mathcal{N}$-free family in $\mathcal{B}_n$. Katona and Tarján proved that $\mathrm{La}(n, \mathcal{N}) \geqslant \binom{n}{k} + A(n, 4, k+1)$, where $k = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ and $A(n, 4, k+1)$ is the size of a single-error-correcting code with constant weight $k+1$. In this note, we prove for n even and $k = n/2$, $\mathrm{La}(n, \mathcal{N}) \geqslant \binom{n}{k} + A(n, 4, k)$, which improves the bound on $\mathrm{La}(n, \mathcal{N})$ in the second order term for some values of n and should be an improvement for an infinite family of values of n, depending on the behavior of the function $A(n, 4, \cdot)$.

Keywords: forbidden subposets, error-correcting codes

1 Introduction

The *n-dimensional Boolean lattice*, $\mathcal{B}_n$, denotes the partially ordered set (poset) $(2^{[n]}, \subseteq)$, where $[n] = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and, for every finite set S, 2^S denotes the set of subsets of S. For posets, $P = (P, \preceq)$ and $P' = (P', \preceq)$, we say P' is a *(weak) subposet* of P if there exists an injection $f : P' \to P$ that preserves the partial ordering. That is, whenever $u \leqslant' v$ in P', we have $f(u) \leqslant f(v)$ in P. If $\mathcal{F}$ is a subposet of $\mathcal{B}_n$ such that $\mathcal{F}$ contains no subposet P, we say $\mathcal{F}$ is *P-free*.

P-free posets (or P-free families) have been extensively studied, beginning with Sperner's theorem in 1928. Sperner [7] proved that the size of the largest antichain in $\mathcal{B}_n$ is $\binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$.

*This work was supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation (#353292, Ryan R. Martin).

Erdős [2] generalized this result to chains. Katona and Tarján [6] addressed the problem of $\mathcal{V}$-free families and got an asymptotic result. Griggs and Katona [5] addressed $\mathcal{N}$-free families, obtaining Theorem 1 below. See Griggs and Li [4] for a survey of the progress on P-free families. Let $\mathrm{La}(n, P)$ denote the size of the largest P-free family in $\mathcal{B}_n$.

The main result of this note is Theorem 4, in which, for some values of n, we improve the bounds on $\mathrm{La}(n, \mathcal{N})$ in the second-order term. The poset $\mathcal{N}$ consists of four distinct sets W, X, Y, Z such that $W \subset X$, $Y \subset X$, and $Y \subset Z$. However, W is not necessarily a subset of Z. See Figure 1. The earliest extremal result on $\mathcal{N}$-free families is Theorem 1.



Figure 1: The $\mathcal{N}$ poset.

Theorem 1 (Griggs and Katona [5])**.**

$$\binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}\left(1+\frac{1}{n}+\Omega\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right)\right) \leqslant \mathrm{La}(n,\mathcal{N}) \leqslant \binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}\left(1+\frac{2}{n}+O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right)\right).$$

The construction for the lower bound of Theorem 1 comes directly from a previous result of Katona and Tarján [6] from 1983 on $\mathcal{V}$-free families. The poset $\mathcal{V}$ consists of three elements X, Y, Z such that $Y \subset X$ and $Y \subset Z$. It is clear that $\mathrm{La}(n, \mathcal{V}) \leqslant \mathrm{La}(n, \mathcal{N})$ because any $\mathcal{V}$-free family is also $\mathcal{N}$-free.

To establish the lower bound, Katona and Tarján used a constant-weight code construction due to Graham and Sloane [3] from 1980. In the proof of Theorem 4, we obtain a lower bound that appears to be larger than the current known bound. However, whether it is an improvement depends on the behavior of some functions well-known in coding theory. In order to discuss our results we need some brief coding theory background.

1.1 Coding Theory Background

Let $A(n, 2\delta, k)$ denote the size of the largest family of $\{0,1\}$-vectors of length n such that each vector has exactly k ones and the Hamming distance between any pair of distinct vectors is at least 2δ. This is the same as the size of the largest family of subsets of $[n]$ such that each subset has size exactly k and the symmetric difference of any pair of distinct sets is at least 2δ.

The quantity $A(n, 2\delta, k)$ is important in the field of error-correcting codes. In fact, $A(n, 4, k)$ computes the size of a single-error-correcting code with constant weight k. Henceforth, we will use "SEC code" as shorthand for "single-error-correcting code."

The first nontrivial value of δ for $A(n, 2\delta, k)$ is $\delta = 2$. Graham and Sloane [3] give a lower bound construction for $A(n, 4, k)$.

Theorem 2 (Graham and Sloane [3])**.** $A(n, 4, k) \geqslant \frac{1}{n}\binom{n}{k}$.

1.2 Main Result

Katona and Tarján [6] estimated the following lower bound for $\mathcal{N}$-free families.

Theorem 3. *Let $k = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. Then,*

$$\mathrm{La}(n, \mathcal{N}) \geqslant \binom{n}{k} + A(n, 4, k+1).$$

The following theorem is our main result of the note.

Theorem 4. *Let n be even and let $k = n/2$. Then,*

$$\mathrm{La}(n, \mathcal{N}) \geqslant \binom{n}{k} + A(n, 4, k). \tag{1}$$

Remark 5. This is potentially an improvement when n is even. We note that the same 3-level construction works for n odd and $k = (n-1)/2$. This gives a family of size $\binom{n}{k} + A(n, 4, k)$ nontrivially in three layers. However, since $A(n, 4, k) = A(n, 4, k+1)$ in the odd case, this does not provide an improvement to the known bounds.

We believe that, for $n \geqslant 6$, the quantity $A(n, 4, k)$ is strictly unimodal as a function of k as long as $3 \leqslant k \leqslant n-3$. This strict unimodality has been established [1] for $6 \leqslant n \leqslant 12$ and known bounds suggest that it is the case for larger values of n as well. If unimodality holds, then $A(n, 4, k)$ would achieve its maximum uniquely at $k = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ or $k = \lceil n/2 \rceil$. Therefore, we expect (1) to also be a strict improvement over Theorem 3 in the case where n is even. However, to our knowledge, the unimodality of $A(n, 4, k)$ has never been established and seems to be a highly nontrivial problem.

Proof of Theorem 4.

Given $k = n/2$, let C be a constant weight SEC code of size $A(n, 4, k)$. Define $C_{\mathrm{up}} := \{c \cup \{i\} : c \in C,\, i \notin c\}$ and $C_{\mathrm{down}} := \{c - \{i\} : c \in C,\, i \in c\}$. Claim 6 gives some important properties of $C_{\mathrm{up}} \cup C_{\mathrm{down}}$.

Claim 6.

(i) Both C_{up} and C_{down} are SEC codes with constant weight $k+1$ and $k-1$, respectively.

(ii) If $c'' \in C_{\mathrm{up}}$ and $c' \in C_{\mathrm{down}}$, $c' \not\subseteq c''$.

Proof. (i). Let $c_1, c_2 \in C_{\mathrm{up}}$. Then $|c_1 \triangle c_2| = |(c_1 - \{i\}) \triangle (c_2 - \{i\})| \geqslant 4$ since $(c_1 - \{i\}), (c_2 - \{i\}) \in C$ and their symmetric difference must be at least 4 in order for C to be a 1-EC code. Thus, C_{up} is a SEC code. By a similar argument, C_{down} is a SEC code.

(ii). Let $c'' \in C_{\mathrm{up}}$, $c' \in C_{\mathrm{down}}$, and $c' \subset c''$. Then, $(c' \cup \{i\}), (c'' - \{i\}) \in C$. So, $|(c'' - \{i\}) \triangle (c' \cup \{i\})| \geqslant 4$. This implies that there are two members of $[n]$ that are in $(c' \cup \{i\}) - (c'' - \{i\})$. One is i and the other is some $j \in c' - c''$, which contradicts the assumption that $c' \subset c''$. This concludes the proof of Claim 6. □

In order to finish the proof, we just need to show that the family $\mathcal{F} := \binom{[n]}{k} \cup C_{\text{up}} \cup C_{\text{down}}$ is $\mathcal{N}$-free.

To that end, suppose there is a subposet $\mathcal{N}$ with elements W, X, Y, Z where $W \subset X$, $Y \subset X$ and $Y \subset Z$ (see Figure 1). Where is the element X?

We know that $X \notin C_{\text{down}}$ because it has to have elements below it and the elements of C_{down} are all minimal in $\mathcal{F}$. We know that $X \notin \binom{[n]}{k}$ because that would force $W, Y \in C_{\text{down}}$ and, being subsets of X would require $|W \triangle Y| = 2$, a contradiction to C_{down} being a SEC code. Therefore, $X \in C_{\text{up}}$.

Now, where is Y? We know that $Y \notin C_{\text{up}}$ because $Y \subset X$. We know $Y \notin \binom{[n]}{k}$ because that would force $X, Z \in C_{\text{up}}$ and thus would force $|X \triangle Z| = 2$, this is a contradiction to the fact that C_{up} is a SEC code. Therefore, $Y \in C_{\text{down}}$.

In order for the copy of $\mathcal{N}$ to exist, $Y \subset X$, which implies $Y \subset X - \{i\}$ and so $|(Y \cup \{i\}) \triangle (X - \{i\})| = 2$. Recall, however, that $Y \cup \{i\}$ and $X - \{i\}$ are distinct members of C and so have symmetric difference at least 4, a contradiction. □

Acknowledgements

We would like to extend our thanks to Kirsten Hogenson and Sung-Yell Song for providing helpful conversations.

References

[1] A. E. Brouwer, J. A. Shearer, N. J. A. Sloane, and W. D. Smith. A New Table of Constant Weight Codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **26 (6)** (1990), pp. 1334–1380.

[2] P. Erdős. On a lemma of Littlewood and Offord. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **51** (1945), pp. 898–902.

[3] R. L. Graham, and N. J. A. Sloane. Lower Bounds for Constant Weight Codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **26** (1980), pp. 37–43.

[4] J. R. Griggs and W.-T. Li. Progress on poset-free families of subsets *The IMA Volumes in Math. and its Appl.* **159** (2016), pp. 317–338.

[5] J. R. Griggs and G. O. H. Katona. No four subsets forming an N. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **115** (2008), pp. 677–685.

[6] G. O. H. Katona and T. G. Tarján. Extremal problems with excluded subgraphs in the n-cube. *Lecture Notes in Math, Springer, Berlin* **1018** (1983), pp. 84–93.

[7] E. Sperner, Ein Satz über Utermegen einer endlichen Menge *Math. Z.* **27** (1928), pp. 544–548.